

15 Universalisms in Debate During the 1940s

International Organizations and the Dynamics of International Intellectual Cooperation in the View of Brazilian Intellectual Miguel Ozório de Almeida

Letícia Pumar

Introduction

The Brazilian intellectual Miguel Ozório de Almeida (1890–1953) graduated in medical studies in the early 20th century but worked as an experimental physiologist during his entire life. During his career, he participated in several intellectual and scientific societies in Brazil and abroad and gained prominence both at the national and international levels. He was a member of the economic and intellectual elite of Rio de Janeiro at a time of great changes in Brazil's educational, political and economic structures and was engaged in the creation of institutions for the enhancement of intellectual life in the country, such as the Brazilian Academy of Sciences and Brazilian Academy of Education. The social network that Ozório de Almeida sought to weave within Brazilian and French intellectual circles in the 1920s was instrumental in his involvement in international intellectual cooperation projects in the 1930s and 1940s.¹

In the interwar period, Miguel Ozório de Almeida took part in the League of Nations' international intellectual cooperation project as a member of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation (IIIC) and the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation (ICIC). His role in these organizations shows how some of the League of Nations' projects became a forum for Latin American intellectuals to develop their internationalism. In the early 1940s, when Germany invaded Paris and the IIIC's activities were interrupted, the French diplomat and director of the IIIC Henri Bonnet went to the United States with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation. There Bonnet became involved in debates to maintain intellectual cooperation activities during the war. The establishment of a temporary center for international cooperation in the Americas was placed on the agenda, and Ozório de Almeida took part in the debates.

Later, as a former member of the IIC and ICIC, Ozório de Almeida participated in the early years of UNESCO. Until his death in 1953, he took part in some of UNESCO's activities and was one of the Brazilian candidates for the position of head of the Natural Sciences Sector and director-general of the organization. At UNESCO, Ozório de Almeida criticized the idea of cooperation as assistance rather than mutual support between intellectuals and scientists from different countries.

In this chapter, I follow Miguel Ozório de Almeida's activities in the last years of the League of Nations' International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation and in the early years of UNESCO to discuss how internationalist projects may raise debates on the dynamics of international intellectual relations. For this purpose, I examine official and personal correspondences that were researched at some Brazilian historical archives, such as Itamaraty and Fiocruz's Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center and UNESCO Archives.

An International Center on Intellectual Cooperation in the Americas

In the mid-1940s, Ozório de Almeida went on one of his trips to France to conduct research at his collaborators' experimental physiology laboratories.² He was in Paris when the city was occupied by Germany. This story is told in his 1943 book *Ambiente de guerra na Europa* [*War Environment in Europe*, free translation].³ During this period, which he called "the battle of civilization", Ozório de Almeida participated in radio programs and wrote articles on the war for French journals. In his book, he described his activities at the IIC, the dinners of the *Cercle de la rue Tournon*⁴ and conversations held with his Brazilian friends living in Paris, among them the chemist Paulo Berredo de Carneiro.⁵ Ozório de Almeida described the IIC's last activities as follows:

On Monday, 10th, around eleven o'clock, I went to the International Institute. The last preparations for everybody's evacuation was under way. Henri Bonnet told me that he would leave in two hours. He tried his utmost to convince me to leave too, whatever way, to reach somewhere at least sixty or seventy kilometers away from Paris. As everywhere else, at the Institute they considered it extremely dangerous to remain in Paris. One should expect the worse to happen. In my case the situation was even more critical because even if the city would be occupied without great sacrifices, the Germans would hold against me many crucial elements: my speeches on the radio, the article just recently published in *Temps*, my papers and manuscripts. Bonnet and I were immensely sad about having to separate after such a long-term collaboration in a perfect spirit of goodwill. None of us knew what would happen to this Intellectual Cooperation to which

Bonnet had given the best of his efforts and all the brightness of his intelligence.⁶

The following days were even sadder for the scientist, who had to burn the war journal he had been writing since September 1939, the copies of the replies to his letter to intellectuals in neutral countries, which would be part of his new volume of the IIC's Intellectual Cooperation Bulletin, the speeches he made on the radio, besides his articles.⁷ A few days later, Ozório de Almeida returned to Rio de Janeiro but kept himself informed on the course of intellectual cooperation. In a letter to Paulo Carneiro, who remained in Paris, he discussed the attempt to appoint the chemist to substitute the deceased Brazilian diplomat E. Montarroyos as representative of Brazil to the IIC:

Here in Rio there is no resolution on Montarroyos' substitute. At this point the International Institute practically does not exist. All its documents are dispersed. [. . .] I received a letter from Henri Bonnet who is currently in New York. He told me that he is only establishing the first contacts with the North Americans to then see what can be done. As for your case, you can be sure: your application has our full support. No one can perform this function better than you. I would like you to tell me as soon as possible if you would accept the position in case the Institute would be located in another city instead of Paris, even if temporarily.⁸

The effort to include Paulo Carneiro in the intellectual cooperation project succeeded only some years later with the creation of UNESCO, to which the chemist became the Brazilian delegate.

When the IIC activities ended, Henri Bonnet traveled to the United States with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation. Together with James Shotwell, head of the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation (linked to the League of Nations' IIC), Bonnet became involved in the debates to maintain the intellectual cooperation activities during the war.⁹ At this point, the development of a temporary intellectual cooperation center in the Americas became part of the agenda of a group of intellectuals in the United States and some Latin American countries.

Bonnet's experience and his relationship with members of national commissions of Latin American countries were initially seen as positive by staff members of the Rockefeller Foundation, who sought to keep him in the United States:

During his stay in this country Mr. Bonnet has been collaborating with Professor James T. Shotwell, the Chairman of the United States Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation, and with Dr.

Waldo G. Leland, Director of the American Council of Learned Societies with regard to the international activities of the Council.

In view of the growing importance of these activities Mr Leland has requested the grant-in-aid now recommended to enable him to secure the services of Mr. Bonnet for the Council and for the United States Committee as a consultant on matters relating to international intellectual cooperation. Such an arrangement Mr Leland and Mr Shotwell believe especially desirable because of the fact that the German government has now taken over the IIC in Paris and has appointed a commissioner to continue its work. To reorganize activities of this kind in the Western Hemisphere, the United States Committee is now endeavoring to arrange a conference of all North and South American committees of intellectual cooperation, which will probably be held in Havana early in 1941. Mr. Leland and Mr. Shotwell feel that Mr. Bonnet's knowledge of earlier work of this type would be invaluable in this effort, particularly because of his previous contacts with South American committees.¹⁰

Ozório de Almeida participated in the debates and was appointed president of the committee to study the possibility of establishing a temporary center of intellectual cooperation in the Americas. The committee was created at the Second American Conference of National Committees on Intellectual Cooperation held in Havana in November 15–21, 1941.¹¹ At this Conference, Brazil was represented by ambassador João Carlos Muñiz, Miguel Ozório de Almeida and Ruy Ribeiro Couto. Ozório de Almeida presented the report "Considerations on measures that should be adopted with the purpose of facilitating and coordinating the relations between the national commissions on intellectual cooperation in the Americas", in which he highlighted the importance of:

Offering the International Institute on Intellectual Cooperation a shelter in a country in the Americas in such a way that it may resume its activities, even if partially. This would enable, among many other aspects, the continuity of the general work on intellectual cooperation without a too long discontinuity. This would also help us to organize on broader and more humane bases the very inter-American cooperation. Finally, we would thus clear all doubts about the real significance and deep meaning of the cooperation movement in the western hemisphere, making evident the principle of universal solidarity that should characterize it.¹²

The other members of the Committee were: James T. Shotwell (United States), Cosme de la Torriente y Peraza (Cuba), Julián Nogueira (Uruguay), Victor Lascano (Argentina), Francisco Walker Linares (Chile) and Alfonso Reyes (Mexico). The appointed technical advisers were:

Malcolm Davis (United States), Henri Bonnet (France), Antonio Castro Leal (Mexico) and Mariano Brull (Cuba).¹³

The meeting “America in face of the world crisis” was held on November 23–25, 1941. Ozório de Almeida was the first participant to take the floor:

I believe that at an intellectuals’ meeting it is not out of place to draw attention to the phenomenon that has occurred in Europe and to what is happening in this side of the Atlantic. Freedom of thought is under threat all over; but this threat is greater to men who have some possibility of thought.¹⁴

The debate continued with the intellectuals’ increasing concern about the risk posed to democracy not only in Europe but also in the Americas, with the strengthening of authoritarian governments and the support of many intellectuals to antidemocratic thought. The meeting resulted in a manifest, which was signed and translated into Portuguese by Ozório de Almeida, with the purpose of defending democracy and opposing authoritarian regimes.¹⁵

Ozório de Almeida was the only Brazilian to sign the Declaration. The anti-authoritarian character of the document most likely caused constraints to the Brazilian government, which since 1937 had assumed a dictatorial character with the so-called *Estado Novo* [New State] promulgated by Getúlio Vargas. It seems that the Brazilian government was at that point losing interest in the issues concerning the IIC and was no longer supporting its actions. In a letter to Paulo Carneiro, Ozório de Almeida explained the situation of the Intellectual Cooperation:

This is what there is concerning the International Institute on Cooperation. Despite all efforts, Henri Bonnet did not succeed in creating in the United States a Secretariat or whatever kind of organization that could give the impression of the Institute’s real survival. He had absolutely no resources for this and the North Americans did not want to or could not support him with this issue. Therefore, the Institute has but a symbolic existence now. It has no place, no staff, it has nothing at all; it has only the representation of its director: H. Bonnet. At the Conference on Intellectual Cooperation in Cuba last November, with this situation clearly understood, a resolution was unanimously voted for the creation of a seven members Commission for the installation of the Institute of Paris in one of the American countries. I was elected as the Commission’s president. A few weeks later the war with the United States started. The Commission could do nothing and we are now taking steps for another decision under the new instances. Thus, you understand that the Brazilian government never again thought of fulfilling the vacancy left with the death

of our poor Montarroyos. Having in fact no Institute, in principle there could be no government's delegate to the Institute.¹⁶

Ozório de Almeida's relationship with Vargas's administration was ambiguous. It is possible to notice that as president of the Brazilian Commission on Intellectual Cooperation [*Comissão Brasileira de Cooperação Intelectual*—CBCI] since 1935, he sought to keep a close relationship with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs so as to obtain the necessary support to participate in the events of his international network of scientists and organizations with an internationalist character and in which he was involved, such as the IIC. Nevertheless, in these national and international forums on intellectual cooperation, he made a stand against authoritarian regimes and the lack of autonomy and freedom of expression during Vargas's dictatorship.¹⁷

At the same time that in the international context Ozório de Almeida defended the maintenance of intellectual cooperation, in the national context he reinforced the importance of the University's role as a place for the development of pure science and complete autonomy of researchers. Ozório de Almeida repudiated the State's interference in the University and research institutions and manifested his opposition to the authoritarian dimension of Vargas' government by defending the intellectuals' autonomy of thought. Therefore, autonomy was not only a practical demand from a group of intellectuals and scientists organized in the Brazilian Academy of Sciences (*Academia Brasileira de Ciências*) and the Brazilian Academy of Education (*Academia Brasileira de Educação*), it was also understood as a moral value that characterized the group. For Ozório de Almeida, the intellectual who deserved to bear this name would have a free consciousness in the face of any authority, political or intellectual, national or international.¹⁸

The post-war period opened new possibilities for international intellectual cooperation, especially with the debate on the creation and development of UNESCO. However, the Brazilian government's growing lack of interest in issues related to the IIC's intellectual cooperation also marked the early negotiations with UNESCO. In a letter from June 1951 to Paulo Carneiro, Ozório de Almeida was clear about this feeling: "The president [Getúlio Vargas] already had a deep antipathy towards the Intellectual Cooperation and has undoubtedly transferred this antipathy to UNESCO. The watchword is to be economical and it will always produce a good effect by pretending to be economical with UNESCO's issues, while there is waste with other issues."¹⁹

"The Old Cooperation" and UNESCO

After the liberation of Paris from the German occupation, the International Institute on Intellectual Cooperation sought the restoration of its

activities. Ozório de Almeida received a letter from French politician Édouard Herriot inviting him to the IIC's Administrative Council to be held in October 1945 in Lyon. In a letter from September 10, 1945, to Paulo Carneiro, Ozório de Almeida asked the Brazilian chemist, who was living in Paris, to attend the Council in his place in case he could not get the government's authorization and financial support in time to go himself to the event. The letter was written in French to "make things easier if by any chance there still is any kind of postal censorship"²⁰ and described the difficulties he was facing with the government, which appeared not to give much importance to issues related to the international intellectual cooperation. Ozório de Almeida mentioned the request he received from the French fellows to support and legitimate the intellectual cooperation model that was being used by them in that Council. According to Herriot, the Council was being scheduled so that the IIC would affirm its existence and the interest it still manifested regarding the intellectual cooperation cause before the London meeting to be held in November that same year, in which the shape of the new international organization on intellectual cooperation would be decided. In the letter to Paulo Carneiro, Ozório de Almeida transcribed parts of Herriot's letter and presented an idea about how he would behave regarding this issue:

I write to you, my dear Paulo, to ask you to substitute me in this meeting and to say on my behalf, in the sense indicated by Herriot in his letter, what you already very well know. You know very well my ideas on this, they are also yours. For the rest, you should let yourself be oriented by Herriot, who is man of great moral and intellectual integrity. Naturally, it should be necessary to deal in great depth with the issue of cooperation in the scientific domain. In the last organization, whose principles are excellent, science occupied a secondary level. We are only beginning to seek the *bases*. Something similar was done in Paris in 1937 and in Geneva in 1939, but there was not enough time to mature the plans. The war has shown what research may offer when organized in a defined sense and with the necessary resources. But I very much persist with the idea that on an organizational plan, even when very well organized, one still leaves a phase for individual, free and disinterested research. I have exposed these ideas in an article in the *Free World* of 1942. Perhaps you can find it in Paris. Therefore, I do not know what can be done and even if it will possible for me to attend the London Conference. Tell the colleagues of the cooperation that, in this case, I am willing to confirm by telegram the resolutions made in accordance with the bases and tradition of the intellectual cooperation organization.²¹

It is clear that although he supported some IIC's bases, Ozório de Almeida wished to see a much greater role for sciences within this new

international organization that would be created. Even before the end of the war, the scientist had already had the opportunity to stress this point in the article mentioned in his letter, *Scientific Research in a Free World*, published in the North American journal *Free World*. Upon exposing his ideas on the importance of applied and pure science in the modern world, the scientist highlighted the moral role of science in a free world. At the end of the article, Ozório de Almeida stated:

If the free world of the future wishes to remain a really free world, it should reserve an important place for pure science, one of the highest and most useful manifestations of human liberty. But it will have to create the sort of mental climate in which science can develop unhindered. Pure Science is the work of a few individuals, the selection of whom is an extremely delicate matter, and this work is not possible without co-operative effort. It is highly desirable that from now on this effort should be studied and prepared.²²

Pure science was defined as a crucial aspect of the modern world, and its development was seen as an essential element to maintain a free world. Moral qualities of men of science—who cultivated pure science, such as the search for truth, cooperation and autonomy and freedom in the face of any kind of intellectual or political authority—were valued by Ozório de Almeida as essential elements for the devolvement of peace in the post-war period. These matters will be recovered in his statements during his first years in UNESCO.

It is possible to notice in the letters exchanged between the two Brazilian scientists the difficulties and controversies engendered by the creation of UNESCO and how Ozório de Almeida felt out of place at the meetings held in London in mid-1946. In a letter dated June 3, 1946, Ozório de Almeida asked Paulo Carneiro's opinion about the need to participate in all the meetings of UNESCO's committees and asked whether it would not be better to participate only at the final part of the Preparatory Commission in London.²³ In a previous letter, the scientist had already demonstrated his concern about spending too much time in London taking part in all the meetings for the preparation of UNESCO, considering that his ticket had been paid for by the French government and, therefore, he would like to spend more time in Paris.²⁴ However, in the letter from June 3, Ozório de Almeida showed signs of the uneasiness he felt in the meetings taking place in London regarding the opposition between the group of old collaborators of the League of Nations' intellectual cooperation project and the new group of UNESCO's creation:

On my side, I confess that I have been feeling a lack of interest in all these issues. This is a new time and I feel that we, those from

the old Cooperation (this is not your case), especially the members of the Geneva Commission and those who worked directly at the Institute of Paris, would show a lack of tact if we insisted in actively participating in the new organization. I much prefer to keep myself reserved and discreet and wait for the evolution of things. Therefore, my wish is not to be present in London, but in the last case I would go to the meeting from 5 to 12 July, much more as an observer than as an active participant. It should be noted that I make no opposition to UNESCO and that I wish that it will be totally successful. Still, I would not feel good about making advances or [illegible] drawing attention to myself.²⁵

Ozório de Almeida did not receive a prompt reply from Paulo Carneiro; thus, on June 12, 1946, he wrote another letter telling about the contents of his previous one and that he thought it would not even be useful to go to the last plenary sessions of UNESCO's Preparatory Commission in London:

I think it is preferable to preserve myself for the definitive Conference to be held in Paris in November, when the permanent UNESCO organization will be decided and in which I could perhaps have some action. There is something unpleasant about the attitude of the new participants concerning the old collaborators of the Intellectual Cooperation and I would not like to lose myself in transitory discussions. It will be better to discuss it in one occasion only and speak my mind, being ready and willing to collaborate in case it seems reasonable to me, or I would rather return if the new tendencies do not please me. [. . .] Have you been with Huxley after his return from the countries in the American continent? What are his impressions? Why were the North Americans removed from the Intellectual Cooperation? Are they really determined to leave aside all that has been achieved and start a new or apparently new life? You understand that in issues of this nature I do not cling to the past, but I consider that it would be a loss of time and effort to throw out the significant study material gathered as a result of much work. The real problem is the same; the circumstances have changed. The ideal thing would be to put together some of those who have the knowledge of the problem and know the circumstances with those who know the circumstances but do not understand the problem yet.²⁶

It seems that Ozório de Almeida preserved himself for the First UNESCO Conference held in Paris in November 1946, where he could make his stand. Though UNESCO represented the achievement of his international cooperation ideals, especially due to the inclusion of sciences as

one of its main concerns, the way in which it was done bothered him somehow. This was made very clear when the scientist addressed the First Paris Conference.

Universalisms in Debate During the Early Years of UNESCO

UNESCO draw on the League of Nations' intellectual cooperation project; however, it sought distance from what were understood as defects and causes of the failure of the previous project, especially concerning its tendency to be considered elitist and Eurocentric.²⁷

UNESCO inherited from the IIC and ICIC some of the staff and cultural programs, such as the revision of school manuals, international university exchange, translation of literary works, the coordination of libraries and archives, among others. Furthermore, French intellectuals who participated in its creation followed a classical and European conception of culture, inspired by the IIC, and conceived UNESCO's action mainly centered on the intellectual domain. However, the IIC also played the role of "countermodel", and many of UNESCO's founders, especially British and North American, tried to avoid the new organization reproducing the problems of its predecessor. Thus, UNESCO was created with the concern of attending the masses, not only an elite (the "*société des esprits*" of Paul Valéry), and with the objective of having a worldwide dimension instead of a European dimension only.

The previous actions of the IIC were seen as elitist because they were restricted to a public composed of specialists and had little concrete achievements; besides, education was not included in its attributions. In contrast, UNESCO gave great importance to education and science, problems of the so-called "underdeveloped" countries and modern mass communication techniques.²⁸

At the moment of its creation, the initial conflict was related to the debate between those who defended that the new organization should have a non-governmental character and those who supported the idea that it should have an intergovernmental nature.²⁹ Over time, the last tendency was strengthened.

The British government was highly interested in the creation of this organization, contributing in a decisive way to the reflections that actually led to it, especially by means of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education (CAME) between 1942 and 1945. Two well-known British scientists, zoologist Julian Huxley (1887–1975) and biochemist Joseph Needham (1900–1995), played an active role in UNESCO's early years, namely in the process of including the term "science" in its name and valorizing the reflection on the social importance of science by this international organization.³⁰

In the memorandum "The place of science and international scientific cooperation in post-war world organisation", of April 1945, Needham

used for the first time the term UNESCO – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (in opposition to UNECO), thus including the “S” for “science”. In this document, Needham highlighted the importance that the new international organization could bring to the domain of international scientific cooperation, especially by providing support to scientists and technicians in distant areas of what he named “bright zones”, i.e., countries in Europe and North America. According to Needham, there was a universal desire among scientists to see better international contacts after the end of the war, but the international cooperation domain was marked by a certain “*laissez-faire*”, which could function very well for North American and European scientists but did not make communication easy between scientists from other regions of the world.

At the November 1945 Conference, the term “science” was officialized in the name of the organization.³¹ From 1946 to 1948, Julian Huxley was the first UNESCO’s director-general, and Joseph Needham was the head of the Natural Sciences Sector.

Huxley’s term as director-general was marked by his evolutionist and positivist ideas; his trust in science to explain phenomena and solve natural and social problems; his advocacy of a better comprehension of science, particularly biology and psychology and his belief in science as the main factor of progress and harmony between the peoples.³² As UNESCO’s director-general, he acted as a mediator between pragmatic liberal forces and leftist forces present in the new organization’s debates.³³

Needham’s actions were in accordance with his “periphery principle” fundamentals and was marked by his experience in China as responsible for the Committee on Scientific Cooperation between China and the United Kingdom in the 1940s. A Christian Marxist, Needham was a Bernalist; that is, he followed the ideas of the British physician John Bernal, a Marxist who had developed works on the social function of science since the 1930s.³⁴ Needham demanded better planning and greater social responsibility in UNESCO’s actions, especially concerning the social role of science. With this international organization, he sought to strengthen independence, economic development and enlargement of scientific knowledge bases in places that had been colonized by Western nations.³⁵

Huxley and Needham had been involved in the movement Social Relation of Science (SRS) in the 1930s. This movement of British scientists defended science and socialism, stressing the social responsibility of science.³⁶ The ideas of this group were influenced by the contact with the history of Soviet science presented at the Second International Congress of the History of Science, held in 1931, especially the Marxist interpretation of Boris Hessen in the work “The Social and Economic Roots of Newton’s Principia”.³⁷

As highlighted by Elzinga, UNESCO’s declared intention was universality, that is, the understanding that science is a common product of

humankind, a public good that exists for the benefit of humanity.³⁸ However, when mentioning universality, there are many projects at stake and UNESCO was the stage of debates on various universalisms.

Huxley's and Needham's ideas brought about proposals and criticism from intellectuals like the Brazilian Miguel Ozório de Almeida and enabled the creation of a space for debates.³⁹ Considering their life experience, the founders of UNESCO as well as Ozório de Almeida affirmed that the so-called "international scientific community" was unfinished, incomplete, deficient and Eurocentric and saw scientific universalism as a project to be built. There were, however, different proposals for the development of this project.

UNESCO mentioned unity and universalism for the area of science but drew on a conception that considered the scientific production in the "not enlightened zones" practically nonexistent. What sort of universality would that be? What kind of international intellectual cooperation does this idea reveal? Perhaps this was the question that Ozório de Almeida posed himself at the time. And this was indeed the question that he openly posed when making his stand at the First UNESCO Conference in November 1946.

Ozório de Almeida participated as a delegate from Brazil, together with Olímpio da Fonseca, Paulo Carneiro and Carlos Chagas Filho. The head of the delegation was Moniz de Aragão, the secretary-general was Georges Maciel, and as experts there were Maria Eugenia Franco, Beatriz Veiga, Isabel de Prado, Jorge Maia, Paulo E. Salles Gomes and Mario Barata. During the Conference, Ozório de Almeida was elected vice-president of the Sub-Commission on Exact and Natural Sciences, and Paulo Carneiro presented the project to create an International Institute of the Amazon Hylea that was discussed and approved.⁴⁰ In May 1946, Paulo Carneiro had proposed creating a research center in the Amazon that was included in a scientific program being designed by the Committee on Natural Sciences of the UNESCO Preparatory Commission under Needham's coordination.

When opening the session of the Sub-Commission on Exact and Natural Sciences held on November 30, 1946, as head of UNESCO's Natural Sciences Sector, Needham reinforced in his speech the importance of his "periphery principle". He stated that he had the opportunity to spend a significant part of his scientific life in different parts of the world, especially in China, where he could have new ideas and open new horizons on certain aspects of science. According to him, those experiences led him to a better understanding of the difficulties encountered in certain parts of the world in the domain of science and technology: "I was able to realize the deadening and sometimes even demoralizing effect produced by the isolation in which certain scientists have to live."⁴¹ Needham mentioned the two brochures handed to the participants with ideas and proposals for

the Sub-Commission on Exact and Natural Sciences, in which appeared the idea of bright zones and dark zones dividing the scientific world. This division, in his view, resulted from purely historical circumstances, and the bright zones should understand how precious their help could be to the less bright zones, both in the material and moral aspects. Needham stressed that the problem was related not only to the isolation in which those regions were, but it also referred to the uneven distribution of natural and industrial resources: "In other words, it is necessary to raise the standard of life in a large part of the world and the living conditions of the non-industrialized peoples".⁴²

He emphasized, therefore, that an international organization's action should have a double aspect: "on the one hand, it must reach the farthest outposts of the world, the less favoured areas; on the other hand, it must also work in the 'bright zone'".⁴³ Regarding the first aspect, one initial action of the Exact and Natural Sciences Sector should be the installation of three Intellectual Cooperation Offices in countries of the so-called periphery, namely in the East, Near East and Latin America. In the "more favored or bright zone", although there were already many international associations on specific branches of scientific knowledge, Needham reinforced the importance of the creation of new associations and the financial support they should receive.

The differentiated lines of action regarding the bright zones and the dark zones should be highlighted. It is likely that this rigid distinction between the actions to be carried out in the different areas did not please Ozório de Almeida. The different conceptions of universalism that were at stake are quite noticeable. While the formulators of UNESCO defended the idea that scientific knowledge was a common good for everyone, Ozório de Almeida understood that the scientific knowledge was made by everyone; thus, it was the result of cooperation.

At the second session of the Sub-Commission on Exact and Natural Sciences held on December 2, 1946, Carlos Chagas Filho praised UNESCO's program for the area of science, stressing the significance of the project proposed by Paulo Carneiro for the creation of the International Institute of the Amazon Hylea. Chagas Filho stressed that the Brazilian delegation did not see it as a national project only but also as an international work. Therefore, the Institute would serve not only all of South America but also the entire civilized world: "We do not consider it as a centre of pure research only, for obtaining new biological and geological data, but as a centre of active research which, in the near future, would be able to solve problems of interest to the whole world".⁴⁴ Finally, the scientist stated: "I should also like to draw your attention to certain points which might limit the effectiveness our work. In the 'dark zones' it is often impossible to find either the men or the material required. Scientists should therefore sometimes be sent to laboratories which are already established there".⁴⁵

In a discreet manner, Chagas Filho sought to indicate the existence of research centers in the so-called dark zones.⁴⁶ This idea was later recalled by Ozório de Almeida in a more incisive speech.

Ozório de Almeida started his speech, as did Carlos Chagas Filho, reaffirming the relevance of the project of the International Institute of the Amazon Hylea for Latin America countries as well as for European countries such as France, The Netherlands and England. Then the scientist presented his view on UNESCO's proposal for the area of sciences:

It is felt that in the projects submitted by the Secretariat too much importance cannot be attached to what are described as the two zones in the civilized world, the "bright zone" and the "dark zone". I think that this division of the world into two zones is not only necessary but obvious. In fact, the history of scientific development shows that progress has always been made in somewhat limited areas. In the world today, however, UNESCO's main function is to spread these "bright zones" and enlighten the "dark zones". This will produce excellent results, but the great question is whether these results will be permanent or only temporary. The interesting question is why has science not developed as it should have done in the countries classified as belonging to "dark zones"? There are countries in these zones which have in the past produced remarkable scientists but have now fallen back to the "dark zones" class. What has been the cause of this decadence? (. . .) We have noticed that, even in "dark zones" countries, some scientific work has been done and that certain personalities have attained the highest standards of scientific research. What are the obstacles which have hampered scientific development and what conditions should be realized to make such development possible? Is there an answer to this question? It depends on practical organization; and if this is so, could UNESCO not assist these countries?⁴⁷

It is possible to notice in Ozório de Almeida's speech that he relativized the idea of bright zones and dark zones by stressing the transitory character of these zones through time. Moreover, he highlighted the existence of scientific works in the dark zones and the importance of UNESCO turning to these scientists to learn about their opinion on this matter. This idea marked Ozório de Almeida's participation at UNESCO. The scientist continued his speech by emphasizing what he called the moral aspect of the issue:

These questions are rather delicate, but we must take them into account. A sort of "scientific imperialism" is practiced by countries which only believe in what has been done in their own country and sometimes despise work done elsewhere. I think it is this state of

mind, when it still exists, which has to some extent prevented scientific development in countries of the “dark zones”.⁴⁸

This is the central point of Ozório de Almeida’s speech. The scientist presented one of the elements that might explain the dark zone condition in some countries: a certain scientific imperialism. Therefore, he attributed the responsibility for the “darkness” of certain zones to the very dynamics of international intellectual relations, marked by historical asymmetries. After mentioning this aspect, the Brazilian scientist highlighted the internal hindrances encountered in these dark zone countries:

I may quote a man who has had a distinguished career, great success in research and who belongs to one of the countries of the “dark zones”. He used to say: “when working in a great scientific country one can afford to be slightly melancholic, or to have doubts which may be favorable to work; but it is painful to realize that in poorer countries ideas have to be proportioned to the material resources at one’s disposal, whereas in other countries the resources are available corresponding to one’s ideas.” This is a fundamental difference in the conditions in which scientific work is carried out.⁴⁹

Therefore, scientists from the dark zones would need to overcome a double obstacle: the material hindrances of the institutions in their countries and the nationalist (or even Eurocentric) tendency regarding international scientific relations. It was a way to say: yes, we need help to counterbalance the asymmetric dynamics of international intellectual relations, but before that, you must listen to us.

Ozório de Almeida and Needham affirmed that the so-called “international scientific community” was incomplete and Eurocentric and considered scientific universalism a project to be built, but their proposals for the solution of the historical discrepancy between regions were quite different.

UNESCO’s projects for the dark zones drew on the idea of science directed to the applicability and replicability of methods and knowledge of the so-called bright zones. According to this conception, the scientific method would offer the possibility to produce “universal” knowledge, that is, that could be applied in different parts of the world, taking progress to different peoples. Thus, cooperation was understood as support to the so-called “dark zones”, instead of mutual support between scientists from different nations. The idea of cooperation would be associated with assistance, rather than to the idea of exchange between scientist from different countries.

This was a very different vision from that professed by Ozório de Almeida, to whom universalization was a process that drew on the cooperation between intellectuals and scientists from different places. Thus,

European scientists would need scientists from the so-called non-bright zones as much as these would need scientists from the bright zones. After all, the non-bright zones were actually not that dark. Ozório de Almeida's concern was to valorize what already existed in the non-bright zones. How could one say to a scientist who had spent his entire life creating space for the production of "pure science" in the area of physiology in Brazil, coming from a family of Rio de Janeiro's intellectual elite involved in debates on the development of the educational and scientific system in the country, that his country belonged to a non-bright zone so darkly pictured by Needham?

In December 1946, the First UNESCO Conference held in Paris approved the project of the International Institute of the Amazon Hylea and the creation of Scientific Cooperation Offices in underdeveloped regions, namely Latin America, Asia and Africa, thus materializing Needham's periphery principle. It is likely that in Ozório de Almeida's view, Needham's periphery principle was applied with no consideration to the real situation of the so-called dark zones of the scientific world, which were actually not always that dark. This idea was latter retrieved by Ozório de Almeida and other Latin American scientists.

Despite the divergence, it is possible to notice Ozório de Almeida's interest in having more effective participation in the new international organization. Paulo Carneiro, who occupied the position of Brazilian delegate to UNESCO, became Ozório de Almeida's strongest link with the institution. While, as previously mentioned, Ozório de Almeida had initially been responsible for the inclusion of Carneiro in the international intellectual cooperation, the Brazilian chemist became the one responsible for keeping a space for Ozório de Almeida in the new international organization. In his letters to Paulo Carneiro, the scientist frequently asked about the situation of UNESCO and how he could help. He was always ready to support Carneiro in whatever way possible and asked for his friend's help to resolve his situation in regard to UNESCO: "I count on you to resolve my position at UNESCO so that I can return to Paris as soon as possible. I am waiting for the title that will enable me to start the survey we have agreed upon on scientific research in Latin America".⁵⁰

In March 1947, Ozório de Almeida sent a letter mentioning that he was anxious to receive some news about UNESCO: "Thus, I am waiting for news from you. I have done nothing yet on the survey about the conditions of scientific work in Latin America because I have not received the necessary official authorization from UNESCO".⁵¹ The scientist constantly demonstrated his dissatisfaction with the Brazilian intellectual environment and gave the impression that he would like to live in Paris. Most likely he saw in UNESCO the possibility to have this idea turned into reality.

During 1947 and 1948, negotiations between Paulo Carneiro and Itamaraty⁵² regarded the possibility that Brazilians could occupy positions at

UNESCO. There was a constant concern of Paulo Carneiro about Ozório de Almeida's application for important positions at the organization.

In an official letter dated January 24, 1947, to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Raul Fernandes, Paulo Carneiro informed him that until that moment, the Brazilian citizens working at UNESCO were Anísio Teixeira (adviser at the Education Sector), Celia Neves (budget directory) and Isadora de Andrade Falcão (assistant at the Music Sector). However, he stated that Huxley, UNESCO's director-general, had the intention of appointing two other advisers to whom he had already sent invitations: Miguel Ozório de Almeida (Natural Sciences Sector) and Rodolfo Paula Lopes (Social Sciences Sector).

In an official letter dated March 14, 1947, to Raul Fernandes, following a list of positions to be occupied in the course of two years, Paulo Carneiro indicated the first great opportunity for Ozório de Almeida:

For the place of Head of the Natural Sciences Sector, which will be vacant in July due to Dr Joseph Needham's return to the University of Cambridge, one of the names most in view is that of Professor Miguel Ozório de Almeida. In a letter sent to me, Dr Joseph Needham expresses the satisfaction he would have by having as his successor the eminent Brazilian scientist.⁵³

The negotiations between Paulo Carneiro and UNESCO might have been in the right direction; however, he needed the support from and the fast and efficient action of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

But the director-general will have to consider for this position the applications presented by several member states and their National Commissions. Therefore, I plea to Your Excellency to please support, on behalf of the Brazilian government, the election of Professor Miguel Ozório de Almeida, whose titles and works indicate him, without any possible competition, to represent Brazil in this high position.⁵⁴

The application did not progress. The position of head of the Natural Sciences Sector was occupied in 1948 by Pierre Auger, a left-wing French physician. This was not the only time that Ozório de Almeida's application presented by Paulo Carneiro failed. In 1948, Paulo Carneiro was involved in an intense campaign for Ozório de Almeida's application for the position of UNESCO's director-general, which did not succeed either.

Although the campaigns for Ozório de Almeida's application for important positions at UNESCO were not successful, the scientist participated as a Brazilian delegate to the 1946 General Conference, previously mentioned, and to the 1949, 1950 and 1952 Conferences.⁵⁵ During this period, he also presented the initial reports for the development of

two UNESCO projects: the History of Humanity and the International Brain Institute.

Final Considerations

The performance of Brazilian physiologist Miguel Ozório de Almeida in international intellectual cooperation projects was marked by the defense of the idea of the universal and peaceful character of intellectual and scientific work. This idea was shared by other researchers at that moment. Negotiations for the creation of a temporary intellectual cooperation center in the Americas soon after the occupation of Paris by Germany in June 1940 showed the increasing role of Latin American intellectuals in the international intellectual network since the interwar period, demonstrated by the role played by Brazilian Miguel Ozório de Almeida at that moment. Nevertheless, the failure of the initiative and the negotiations in UNESCO's early years also point to the asymmetries that constituted the dynamics of international intellectual relations. Anyhow, the intellectual cooperation project of the League of Nations was used as a forum for Ozório de Almeida's criticism of Getúlio Vargas's authoritarian government in Brazil and for his defense of intellectual work autonomy; it was also crucial for the strengthening of relations between the Brazilian scientist Ozório de Almeida and European and Latin American intellectuals. UNESCO was also an important forum for the development of that network of intellectuals, and Ozório de Almeida used it for his criticism of what he understood as a certain "scientific imperialism" that hindered the international relations of intellectuals.

Notes

1. This article was part of my PhD thesis that was assisted by the scholarship from Capes—Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education (Brazil) and the Grant-in-aid of the Rockefeller Archive Center (New York).
2. On Miguel Ozório de Almeida's intellectual and scientific trajectory, see Letícia Pumar, "The Idea of Science of Brazilian Physiologist Miguel Ozório de Almeida (1890–1953)", *Transversal*, n. 3 (2017): 51–67.
3. Miguel Ozório de Almeida, *Ambiente de guerra na Europa* (Rio de Janeiro: Atlântica, 1943).
4. A group of intellectuals, diplomats and scientists from France, including Bonnet, Paul Rivet, Madame Vacher, Henri Laugier, Louis Lapicque, Paul Langevin, Henri Piéron, Pierre Janet, Jacques Hadamard, Jean and Francis Perrin, Louis Rapkine, Marcel Mauss, Paul Valéry and Henri Focillon, who normally met once a month to dine and debate.
5. Paulo Estevão de Berredo Carneiro (1901–1982), under family influence, since very early in life had contact with positivism and became one of its greatest adepts in Brazil. He had a significant role at UNESCO as Brazil's permanent representative. On different aspects of his trajectory, see Marcos Chor Maio, *Ciência, política e relações científicas internacionais: ensaios sobre Paulo Carneiro* (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Fiocruz; Unesco, 2004).
6. Ozório de Almeida, *Ambiente de guerra na Europa*, 167–168.

7. On his participation at the IIIC and ICIC, his articles in the Intellectual Cooperation Bulletin and his correspondence with Henri Bonnet in the 1930s, see Letícia Pumar, “Between National and International Science and Education: Miguel Ozório de Almeida and the League of Nations’ Intellectual Cooperation Project,” in *Beyond Geopolitics: New histories of Latin America at the League of Nations*, ed. Alan McPherson and Yannick Wehrli (New Mexico: New Mexico Press, 2015), 169–184.
8. Miguel Ozório de Almeida to Paulo Carneiro, 3 October 1940, Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Paulo Carneiro, Departamento de Arquivo e Documentação da Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro.
9. Bonnet, Henri—refugee scholars (1940–1941), RF. RG1.1 Series 200, box 48, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York.
10. Memorandum signed by David H. Stevens, Director for the Humanities, 20 November 1940, Bonnet, Henri—refugee scholars (1940–1941), RF. RG1.1 Series 200, box 48, folder 554, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York.
11. R.F. R.G. 1.1 Series 100S, box 111, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York.; E. E. Ware, Second American Conference of National Committees on Intellectual Cooperation. Havana, Cuba, November 15–22, 1941; and Report to the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation (New York, 1942).
12. Miguel Ozório de Almeida, “Considerações das medidas que devem ser adoptadas com o fim de facilitar e coordenar as relações entre as comissões nacionais de cooperação intelectual na América”, box 142.6, folder 1688, file 3528.3, 10, Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Historical Archives, Rio de Janeiro.
13. E. E. Ware, Second American Conference of National Committees on Intellectual Cooperation. Havana, Cuba, November 15–22, 1941. Report to the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation (New York, 1942), 61.
14. Comissão Cubana de Cooperación Intelectual, *Plática de la Havana: América ante la crisis mundial* (Havana: La Habana, 1942), 68–69.
15. The manifest was signed on November 25, 1941, by the following American and European intellectuals: Count Sforza, Henri Focillón, Henri Bonnet, Arnold Raestad, Henri Laugier, R. P. McKeon, G. A. Borgese, Joseph W. Krutch, Stringfellow Barr, Marshall H. Stone, George F. Zook, Louis Adamic, W. E. Burghardt du Bois, Freda Kirchwey, Cosme de la Torriente, Afonso Reys, Miguel Ozório de Almeida, María Zambrano, Dantés Bellegarde, César Barja, Pere Bosch-Gimpera, Juan Marinello, Jorge Manach, Fernando Ortiz, Salvador Massip, Hermínio Portell Vilá. See E. E. Ware, Second American Conference of National Committees on Intellectual Cooperation. Havana, Cuba, November 15–22, 1941. Report to the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation (New York, 1942), 37.
16. Miguel Ozório de Almeida to Paulo Carneiro. 6 January 1942, Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Paulo Carneiro, Departamento de Arquivo e Documentação da Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro.
17. Pumar, “Between National and International Science and Education,” 169–184.
18. Letícia Pumar Alves de Souza, *A ciência e seus fins: internacionalismo, universalismo e autonomia na trajetória do fisiologista Miguel Ozório de Almeida (1890–1953)*. Thesis. Ph.D. in History of Sciences and Health. (Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro, 2015).
19. Miguel Ozório de Almeida to Paulo Carneiro. 14 June 1951, Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Paulo Carneiro, Departamento de Arquivo e Documentação da Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro.

20. Miguel Ozório de Almeida to Paulo Carneiro. 6 September 1945, Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Paulo Carneiro, Departamento de Arquivo e Documentação da Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro.
21. Ibid.
22. Miguel Ozório de Almeida, “Scientific Research in a Free World,” *Free World*, v. 2, n. 4, (May, 1942).
23. Miguel Ozório de Almeida to Paulo Carneiro. 3 June 1946, Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Paulo Carneiro, Departamento de Arquivo e Documentação da Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro.
24. Miguel Ozório de Almeida to Paulo Carneiro, 25 April 1946, Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Paulo Carneiro, Departamento de Arquivo e Documentação da Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro.
25. Miguel Ozório de Almeida to Paulo Carneiro. 3 June 1946, Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Paulo Carneiro, Departamento de Arquivo e Documentação da Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro.
26. Miguel Ozório de Almeida to Paulo Carneiro, 12 June 1946, Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Paulo Carneiro, Departamento de Arquivo e Documentação da Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro.
27. Maurel Chloé, *L’Unesco de 1945 à 1974*. Thesis, Ph.D. in History. (École Normale Supérieure de Paris, Université Panthéon-Sorbonne—Paris I, Paris, 2006).
28. Ibid.
29. Aant Elzinga, “A Unesco e a política de cooperação internacional no campo da ciência,” in *Ciência, política e relações científicas internacionais: ensaios sobre Paulo Carneiro*, ed. Marcos Chor Maio (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Fiocruz; Unesco, 2004), 89–144.
30. Ibid.
31. ECO/CONF/29. Conference for the Establishment of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Held at the Institute of Civil Engineers, London, from the 1st to the 16th November 1945, 102.
32. On his defense of “evolutionary humanism” and his engagement, together with other biologists of the time, in a movement that sought to unify biology and integrate the sciences into the traditional humanistic concerns, see Vasiliki Betty Smocovitis, “The Unifying Vision: Julian Huxley, Evolutionary Humanism, and the Evolutionary Synthesis,” in *Pursuing the Unity of Science: Ideology and Scientific Practice Between the Great War and the Cold War*, ed. Geert Somsen and Harmke Kamminga (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).
33. Elzinga, “A Unesco e a política de cooperação internacional no campo da ciência”.
34. John Bernal, *The Social Function of Science* (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1939).
35. Elzinga, “A Unesco e a política de cooperação internacional no campo da ciência”.
36. Patrick Petitjean, “Needham, Anglo-French Civilities and Ecumenical Science,” in *Situating the History of Science: Dialogues with Joseph Needham*, ed. S. Irfan Habib and Dhruv Raina (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999), 152–197.
37. Gideon Freudenthal and Peter McLaughlin, *The Social and Economic Roots of the Scientific Revolution* (Berlin: Springer, 2009).
38. Elzinga. “A Unesco e a política de cooperação internacional no campo da ciência”.
39. On the relationship of Brazilian scientists with UNESCO, see Heloisa Bertol Domingues and Patrick Petitjean, “International Science, Brazil and Diplomacy in Unesco (1946–50),” *Science, Technology & Society*, v. 9, n. 1 (2004);

- Marcos Chor Maio, *Ciência, política e relações científicas internacionais: ensaios sobre Paulo Carneiro* (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Fiocruz; Unesco, 2004); Patrick Petitjean, “Le Département des Sciences naturelles de l’UNESCO et les scientifiques latino-américains à la fin des années 1940,” *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi. Ciências Humanas*, Belém, v. 4, n. 3 (2009): 437–452.
40. On the International Institute of the Amazon Hylea, see: Marcos Chor Maio and Magali Romero Sá, “Ciência na periferia: a Unesco, a proposta de criação do Instituto Internacional da Hileia Amazônica e as origens do Inpa,” *História, Ciências, Saúde—Manguinhos*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 6, supl. (set. 2000): 975–1017; Patrick Petitjean and Heloísa M. B. Domingues, “A redescoberta da Amazônia num projeto da UNESCO: o Instituto Internacional da Hileia Amazônica,” *Estudos Históricos*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 14, n. 26 (2000): 265–292.
 41. UNESCO. General Conference; 1st; 1946, Programme Commission/Sub-commission on Natural Sciences: Provisional verbatim record of the Second meeting Publ: 1946; UNESCO/C/Prog.Com./S.C.Nat.Sci./V.R.1, 4.
 42. *Ibid.*, 5.
 43. *Ibid.*
 44. *Ibid.*, UNESCO/C/Prog.Com./S.C.Nat.Sci./V.R.2, 7.
 45. *Ibid.*, 8.
 46. Carlos Chagas Filho (1910–2000), son of the scientist Carlos Chagas, of Oswaldo Cruz Institute, was the founder of the Institute of Biophysics at the University of Brazil, considered a landmark in the institutionalization of science in Brazil. As the director of the Institute of Biophysics, which received foreigners to conduct researches in Brazil, Chagas Filho indicated that “centers of excellence” existed in the dark zones.
 47. UNESCO. General Conference; 1st; 1946, Programme Commission/ Sub-commission on Natural Sciences: Provisional verbatim record of the Second meeting Publ: 1946; UNESCO/C/Prog.Com./S.C.Nat.Sci./V.R.2, .9–11.
 48. *Ibid.*, 11.
 49. *Ibid.*, 12.
 50. Miguel Ozório de Almeida to Paulo Carneiro. 12 February 1947, Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Paulo Carneiro, Departamento de Arquivo e Documentação da Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro.
 51. Miguel Ozório de Almeida to Paulo Carneiro, 15 March 1947, Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Paulo Carneiro, Departamento de Arquivo e Documentação da Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro.
 52. The Foreign Ministry of Affairs, also known as Itamaraty, is responsible for Brazilian foreign policy and international relations in bilateral, regional and multilateral levels.
 53. Paulo Carneiro to Raul Fernandes, 14 March 1947, Unesco delegação do Brasil (Ofícios 1947–1948), no. 80/4/1, Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Historical Archives (Itamaraty), Rio de Janeiro, 1.
 54. *Ibid.*, 2.
 55. Curriculum vitae: Miguel Ozório de Almeida. Unesco 2.512 (3), Delegations of Member States—SCHM, UNESCO Archives, Paris.

References

American Conference of National Committees on Intellectual Cooperation. Havana, Cuba, November 15–22, 1941. Report to the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation (New York, 1942).

- Bernal, John, *The Social Function of Science* (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1939).
- Chloé, Maurel, *L'Unesco de 1945 à 1974*. Thesis, Ph.D. in History. (École Normale Supérieure de Paris, Université Panthéon-Sorbonne—Paris I, Paris, 2006).
- Comissão Cubana de Cooperación Intelectual. *Plática de la Havana: América ante la crisis mundial* (Havana: La Habana, 1942).
- de Souza, Letícia Pumar Alves, *A ciência e seus fins: internacionalismo, universalismo e autonomia na trajetória do fisiologista Miguel Ozório de Almeida (1890–1953)*. Thesis. Ph.D. in History of Sciences and Health. (Casa de Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro, 2015).
- Domingues, Heloisa Bertol and Patrick Petitjean, “International Science, Brazil and Diplomacy in Unesco (1946–50),” *Science, Technology & Society*, v. 9, n. 1 (2004).
- ECO/CONF/29. Conference for the Establishment of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Held at the Institute of Civil Engineers, London, from the 1st to the 16th November 1945.
- Elzinga, Aant, “A Unesco e a política de cooperação internacional no campo da ciência,” in *Ciência, política e relações científicas internacionais: ensaios sobre Paulo Carneiro*, ed. Marcos Chor Maio (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Fiocruz; Unesco, 2004): 89–144.
- Freudenthal, Gideon and Peter McLaughlin, *The Social and Economic Roots of the Scientific Revolution* (Berlin: Springer, 2009).
- Maio, Marcos Chor, *Ciência, política e relações científicas internacionais: ensaios sobre Paulo Carneiro* (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Fiocruz; Unesco, 2004).
- Maio, Marcos Chor and Magali Romero Sá, “Ciência na periferia: a Unesco, a proposta de criação do Instituto Internacional da Hileia Amazônica e as origens do Inpa,” *História, Ciências, Saúde—Manguinhos, Rio de Janeiro*, v. 6, supl. (set. 2000): 975–1017.
- Ozório de Almeida, Miguel, *Ambiente de guerra na Europa* (Rio de Janeiro: Atlântica, 1943).
- Ozório de Almeida, Miguel, “Scientific Research in a Free World,” *Free World*, v. 2, n. 4 (May, 1942).
- Petitjean, Patrick, “Le Département des Sciences naturelles de l’UNESCO et les scientifiques latino-américains à la fin des années 1940,” *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi. Ciências Humanas, Belém*, v. 4, n. 3 (2009): 437–452.
- Petitjean, Patrick, “Needham, Anglo-French Civilities and Ecumenical Science,” in *Situating the History of Science: Dialogues with Joseph Needham*, ed. S. Irfan Habib and Dhruv Raina (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999), 152–197.
- Petitjean, Patrick and Heloisa M. B. Domingues, “A redescoberta da Amazônia num projeto da UNESCO: o Instituto Internacional da Hileia Amazônica,” *Estudos Históricos, Rio de Janeiro*, v. 14, n. 26 (2000): 265–292.
- Pumar, Letícia, “Between National and International Science and Education: Miguel Ozório de Almeida and the League of Nations’ Intellectual Cooperation Project,” in *Beyond Geopolitics: New Histories of Latin America at the League of Nations*, ed. Alan McPherson and Yannick Wehrli (New Mexico: New Mexico Press, 2015), 169–184.
- Pumar, Letícia, “The Idea of Science of Brazilian Physiologist Miguel Ozório de Almeida (1890–1953),” *Transversal*, n. 3 (2017): 51–67.

Smocovitis, Vassiliki Betty, "The Unifying Vision: Julian Huxley, Evolutionary Humanism, and the Evolutionary Synthesis," in *Pursuing the Unity of Science: Ideology and Scientific Practice Between the Great War and the Cold War*, ed. Geert Somsen and Harmke Kamminga (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

UNESCO. General Conference; 1st; 1946, Programme Commission/Sub-commission on Natural Sciences: Provisional verbatim record of the Second meeting Publ: 1946; UNESCO/C/Prog.Com./S.C.Nat.Sci./V.R.1.